

REMARKS

Claims 11-22 were pending in the application. Claims 18-22 have been withdrawn. Claims 11 and 18 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Therefore, claims 11-22 remain pending and are resubmitted for consideration.

I. Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to for failing to show: (1) the first and second elements; (2) the second element moving by means of the first element; and (3) simultaneously moving a second of two elements in a direction opposite to that of the first of two elements. Applicants respectfully disagree with the objections.

With regard to (1) above, Figures 2 and 3 illustrate a guide or first element 13 and a guide or second element 7. The application states that, according to an embodiment, the guide 7 corresponds to the first element and that a guide 13 corresponds to the second element. *See* Application at ¶¶ [0027] and [0031].

With regard to (2) above, the drawings show that the guide or second element 13 can be moved by the guide or first element 7. *See* Application at Fig. 2 and ¶ [0033], which clearly explains this concept. For example, as guide or first element 7 moves in the direction of P2, the guide or second element 13 can move together with the guide 7.

With regard to (3) above, Figure 3 illustrates that the guide or second element 13 can be moved simultaneously in a direction opposite to the direction of the guide or first element 7. Arrows P6 and P7 illustrate the movement of guides (7) and (13) in opposite directions. *See* Application at Fig. 3 and ¶ [0034].

Therefore, the objections to the drawings are improper. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 11-17 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph, as being indefinite for substantially the same reasons advanced with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The rejections should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner contends that the claims are not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention with respect to the second element being moved by the first element and simultaneously moving a second of the two elements in a direction opposite to the direction of the first of element. The Examiner further contends that the specification does not clarify what comprises the second of the two elements.

The specification clearly states that the second element, according to an embodiment, can be guide 13. *See* Application at ¶ [0031]. The specification further explains that the guide or second element 13 can be moved by the guide or first element 7. *See* Application at Figs. 2 and 3 and ¶ [0033]. Furthermore, the specification and figures explain that, in an embodiment, the guide or second element 13 can be moved, relative to the guide or first element 7, simultaneously in a direction opposite to the direction of the guide or first element 7. Arrows P6 and P7 illustrate the movement of guides (first and second elements) 7 and 13 in opposite directions. *See* Application at Fig. 3 and ¶ [0034]. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, is improper. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Roos

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,397,456 (hereinafter “Roos”). Independent claim 11 has been amended. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

A. The Claims

Claim 11 recites a method of moving at least two elements using a placement machine that comprises:

moving a first of the two elements in a predetermined direction to cause a corresponding movement of the second of the two elements in the predetermined direction; and
while the first element moves in the predetermined direction, at a desired position moving the second element relative to the first element in a direction opposite to the predetermined direction to cause the second element to be stationary relative to the desired position.

Claims 12-15 depend from claim 11.

B. Roos

Roos does not teach or suggest a method of moving at least two elements using a placement machine in which “while the first element moves in the predetermined direction, at a desired position moving the second element relative to the first element in a direction opposite to the predetermined direction to cause the second element to be stationary relative to the desired position” as recited in claim 11.

Roos discloses an automatic mounting machine for electronic components. The machine comprises an X-carriage 43 movable horizontally, a pick-up head 41 with a base plate 45 movable in a Z-direction. The base plate 45 includes an arm 47 with a pipette 49 rigidly attached. The pipettes 49 are movable in a Z-direction. *See* Roos col. 4, lines 3-22. The pipettes 49 are moved with movement of the base plate 45. *See* Roos at Fig. 4. However, there is no disclosure in Roos of the pipettes 49 being stationary relative to a desired position (component pick up location or mounting position) while the base plate 45 moves. Therefore, Roos does not teach or suggest a method in which “while the first element moves in the predetermined direction, at a desired position moving the second element relative to the first element in a direction opposite to the predetermined direction to cause the second element to be stationary relative to the desired position” as recited in claim 11.

Furthermore, even assuming that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify Roos as indicated in the Office Action on page 4, Roos still would not provide a method as claimed. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Roos is improper.

Claims 12-15 depend from claim 11 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Roos & Kashiwagi

Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roos in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,864,944 (hereinafter “Kashiwagi”). The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 11. Roos and Kashiwagi, taken together or separately, fail to teach or suggest a method of moving at least two elements using a placement machine in which “while the first element moves in the predetermined direction, at a desired position moving the second element relative to the first element in a direction opposite to the predetermined direction to cause the second element to be stationary relative to the desired position” as recited in claim 11. Roos merely discloses pipettes 49 that are attached to a base plate 45 of a carriage 41. *See* Roos at Fig. 4. The pipettes 49 are not stationary relative to a desired position (component pick up location or mounting position) while the base plate 45 moves. Kashiwagi fails to cure the deficiencies of Roos.

Even if, assuming *arguendo*, that Kashiwagi teaches a mounting apparatus that comprises a line image sensor as suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Roos and Kashiwagi still fails to teach or suggest a method of moving at least two elements using a placement machine in which “while the first element moves in the predetermined direction, at a desired position moving the second element relative to the first element in a direction opposite to the predetermined direction to cause the second element to be stationary relative to the desired position” as recited in claim 11. Thus, the rejection of dependent claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

V. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 22, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 295-4776
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By J. Cahill

Jessica M. Cahill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,986